

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action dated November 28, 2008 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Claims 22-35 have been added. The added claims are fully supported by the original disclosure and no new matter has been introduced.

Specification

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, it was asserted that Claim 1 includes the term "call-flow application", and this term does not appear in the specification.

Although the term "call-flow application" is not exactly mentioned in the specification, the term "callflow" is mentioned frequently in the specification. A person skilled in the art, after reading the specification, would understand that the term "callflow" refers to a "call-flow application" from the context such as the terms "callflow designer," "callflow development," and "callflow element." Nevertheless, the term "call-flow application" has been deleted in order to facilitate the prosecution of the instant application.

Claim Objections

Claim 2 was objected to because of informalities. More specifically, it was asserted that the limitation "displaying the grammar files when a user selects the grammar files " is optionally stated

Appropriate correction has been made.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. More specifically, it was asserted that it is unclear as to whether the call flow development GUI is the same as the call-flow application and it is also unclear as to what is meant by terms "call flow graphical user interface" and "call-flow application."

It is noted that the term "call-flow application" has been deleted from the claims and the language of the claims has been modified to clearly recite a callflow development graphical user interface (GUI) of a graphical callflow development system.

It was also asserted that the limitation "wherein each user-defined grammar file was written by a user of a call-flow application and each built-in grammar file was available when the call-flow application was installed" is unclear because it recites actions that occur in the past, but that are not included in the claim. The claims language has been modified to overcome the asserted deficiency.

It was further asserted that it is unclear as to what will be displayed in Claim 2 if the files are already displayed in Claim 1. It is noted that Claim 2 specifically recites that the files will be displayed only upon user's selection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. It was asserted that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Although Applicants do not agree that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, the Examiner's suggested amendments have been adopted in order to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the

Appln. No. 10/664,280
Response dated January 16, 2009
Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2008
Docket No. BOC9-2003-0060 (434)

undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 16, 2009

/Gregory A. Nelson/
Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-500